

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings, under 37 CFR 1.83(a), for not illustrating the "bellows formed between the reduction nut and the adjuster"; and under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference sign(s), 230 and 232, mentioned in the description, and because the drawings have rough, blurred and pale lines.

In regard to the objection to the drawings for not illustrating the bellows (as recited in claim 4), Applicant submits that replacement Figure 5 now illustrates the present claimed bellows (230). In regard to the objection to the drawings for not including reference numerals (230, 232) mentioned in the Specification, Applicant submits that replacement Figure 5 now includes reference numeral 230, and reference numeral 232 has been replaced in the Specification with reference numeral 211. In regard to the objection to the drawings for having rough, blurred and pale lines, Applicant submits that new draftsman quality (i.e., clear drawings having well-defined lines) Replacements figures 1-12 (including Figures 9a and 9b) are attached hereto. Accordingly, the aforementioned objections to the drawings are believe to be moot and should be withdrawn.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional (or operational) language. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to clarify the present claimed invention, and to better

conform with accepted U.S. patent practice. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-8 are believed to be moot, and be withdrawn.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 as being clearly anticipated by YGGER (U.S. Patent No. 1,885,400).

Applicant respectfully traverses the above noted rejection of 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Initially, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to clarify that the reduction nut (or rotating nut, as recited in independent claim 5) receives the screen inserting part. In this regard, Applicant notes that YGGER fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 sets forth a reduction device including, inter alia, a reduction nut having a second groove provided on its peripheral surface, which receives the screen inserting part of the winding bar.

Applicant submits that YGGER lacks any disclosure of the above-noted combination of elements.

The Examiner cites to YGGER as purportedly disclosing the present claimed invention. More particularly, the Examiner asserts that the device of YGGER includes a screw threaded stud (12), a nut (18) and a coil spring (20)[see, page 4, paragraph 3, of the Official Action]. However, YGGER discloses the nut (18) being mounted on the legs of a yoke (or U-Shaped member). In other words, YGGER discloses the cut out portions of the nut (18) receiving the guides (21) of the U-shaped member. Thus, YGGER does not

disclose at least the reduction nut having a groove provided on its peripheral surface, which receives the screen inserting part of the winding bar.

Applicant further submits that independent claim 5 is generally similar to independent claim 1 in that it recites, *inter alia*, a rotating nut, which receives the screen inserting part of the winding bar. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable for reasons generally similar to claim 1, as discussed above.

Absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 5, as well as claims 2-4 and 6-8 respectively depending therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Further, all pending dependent claims recite additional features that further define the present invention over the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allow all pending claims in the present application.

In view of the arguments herein, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 5 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 Applicant assert that these claims are allowable on their own merit, as well as because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 5, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.


SUMMARY/ARGUMENTS

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an indication to that effect. Applicant has argued the allowability of the claims and pointed out deficiencies of the applied reference. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection is made by the present amendment. The amendments to the claims have not been made for a purpose related to patentability, but rather are clarifying amendments that are cosmetic in nature by rendering explicit what was already implied in these claims, *i.e.*, that the reduction nut (or rotating nut, as recited in independent claim 5) receives the screen inserting part. The amendments to the claims should thus be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto. Accordingly, this amendment should not be considered a decision by Applicant to narrow the claims in any way.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jae-Suk KWAK

  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

William E. Lyddane  
Reg. No. 41,568

December 11, 2006  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1941 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191